

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 INTEGRITY TRUST, by its trustee, Jon
10 Cuddeback,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 CAPITAL ONE, N.A., *et al.*,

14 Defendants.

Case No. C16-927RSL

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF
SANCTIONS

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration of Sanctions for Attorney Fees and Costs." Dkt. # 44. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or "new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has shown neither. Moreover, in objecting to the sanctions ordered by the Court, see Dkt. # 41, plaintiff argues that defendants inflated their litigation costs by failing to move for dismissal of a case that plaintiff filed but "never commenced against any defendant." Dkt. # 44. Of course, defendants did move to dismiss this case. Dkt. # 15. Plaintiff's opposition to that motion to dismiss, Dkt. # 19, and eventual appeal of the Court's order granting that motion to dismiss, Dkt. # 35, belie plaintiff's assertion that anyone but plaintiff is to blame for extending the life of this frivolous lawsuit.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION - 1

For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 44) is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this 19th day of May, 2017.

Mrs Lasnik
Robert S. Lasnik
United States District Judge

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION - 2**